DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL JAN 26 1998 Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION & 6 1008 Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of)	
)	
Amendments to Uniform System of)	CC Docket No. 97-212
Accounts for Interconnection)	

REPLY OF U S WEST, INC.

U S WEST, Inc. ("U S WEST") hereby replies to comments filed in response to the Federal Communications Commission's ("Commission") Notice of Proposed Rulemaking ("NPRM") on the accounting treatment related to interconnection and shared infrastructure. US WEST concurs in the reply comments filed by the United States Telephone Association ("USTA") herein today. In this Reply, U S WEST provides supplemental comments on one issue -- the Commission's proposal that incumbent local exchange carriers ("ILEC") conduct special studies to determine how interconnection and unbundled network element ("UNE") costs should be assigned among subsidiary accounts (i.e., the sub-accounts that the Commission proposes to require ILECs to create for interconnection purposes).²

As a preliminary matter U S WEST reiterates that it opposes, as USTA did

¹ In the Matter of Amendments to Uniform System of Accounts for Interconnection, CC Docket No. 97-212, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, FCC 97-355, rel. Oct. 7, 1997.

² <u>Id.</u> ¶ 14.

in its comments, the creation of any new Part 32 accounts to deal with interconnection. US WEST also opposes the Commission's proposal that ILECs be required to conduct special cost studies to assign costs to subsidiary records. This would be a burdensome task that would have little, if any, impact on the allocation of costs between jurisdictions. From the Commission's NPRM it appears that an ILEC would be required to conduct a special cost study for each UNE and interconnection arrangement contained in each arbitration agreement in each state with periodic updates to reflect state action that alters the underlying cost structure. It appears that the results of these studies would be used to assign interconnection and UNE costs contained in Part 32 accounts (i.e., pre-separations) on a monthly basis to the different jurisdictions. This approach would require an enormous amount of effort (and significant expense) to arrive at basically the same result (i.e., the same cost assignments) that would be obtained if interconnection costs and revenues were allowed to flow through separations.

The Commission's proposed approach neither enhances the accuracy of accounting information nor does it serve administrative efficiency. Therefore, the Commission should discard its pre-separations cost study proposal. U S WEST recommends that the Commission require interconnection revenues be assigned to Account 5240, Misc. Rents, and that these revenues be separated based on the

³ U S WEST participated in developing USTA's initial comments, filed Dec. 9, 1997 in this proceeding and concurs in them.

⁴ See USTA Comments at 2, 8, 10.

⁵ NPRM ¶ 14.

overall separations factors for the underlying plant. The results would be substantially the same as under the Commission's proposal without unnecessarily expending a significant amount of time and effort to disaggregate pre-separations costs.

Respectfully submitted,

U S WEST, INC.

By:

James T. Hannon

Suite 700

1020 19th Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20036

(303) 672-2860

Its Attorney

Of Counsel, Dan L. Poole

January 26, 1998

Simply put, removing costs pre-separations reduces post-separations costs by an amount equal to the product of pre-separations costs multiplied by the composite assignment factor. For example, if a carrier has \$100 million in unbundled loop revenues, removing \$100 million in unbundled loop costs pre-separations would reduce the amount of costs to be recovered from all other rate elements by \$75 million in the intrastate jurisdiction and \$25 million in the interstate jurisdiction (i.e., since the composite allocation factor for loop costs is 75% intrastate/25% interstate). The same result would be achieved by recording the \$100 million in unbundled loop revenue in Account 5240 and assigning 75% of this revenue to the intrastate jurisdiction and 25% to the interstate jurisdiction. This would reduce post-separations costs to be recovered from other rate elements by \$75 million in the intrastate jurisdiction and by \$25 million in the interstate jurisdiction.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Kelseau Powe, Jr., do hereby certify that on this 26th day of January, 1998, I have caused a copy of the foregoing **REPLY OF U S WEST, INC.** to be served, via first class United States Mail, postage pre-paid, upon the persons listed on the attached service list.

Kelseau Powe, Jr

^{*}Served via hand-delivery.

*William E. Kennard Federal Communications Commission Room 814 1919 M Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20554 *Gloria Tristani Federal Communications Commission Room 826 1919 M Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20554

*Michael K. Powell Federal Communications Commission Room 844 1919 M Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20554 *Harold Furchtgott-Roth Federal Communications Commission Room 802 1919 M Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20554

*Susan P. Ness Federal Communications Commission Room 832 1919 M Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20554 *A. Richard Metzger, Jr. Federal Communications Commission Room 500 1919 M Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20554

*Matthew Vitale Federal Communications Commission Room 200F 2000 L Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20554 *Lynn Vermillera Federal Communications Commission Room 200E 2000 L Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20554

(Including 3x5 diskette w/cover letter)

*International Transcription Services, Inc. 1231 20th Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20036 Lauren B. Meinster Bellcore PYA-2E237 3 Corporate Place Piscataway, NJ 08854 Alan N. Baker Ameritech Operating Companies 2000 West Ameritech Center Drive Hoffman Estates, IL 60196 Lawrence W. Katz Bell Atlantic Telephone Companies 8th Floor 1320 North Court House Road Arlington, VA 22201

Laura H. Phillips COX
J.G. Harrington
Christopher D. Libertelli
Dow, Lohnes & Albertson, PLLC
Suite 800
1200 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

Snavely, King, Majoros, O'Connor & Lee, Inc. Suite 410 1200 L Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005

John F. Raposa GTE Service Corporation POB 152092 Irving, TX 75015 Gail L. Polivy GTE Service Corporation Suite 1200 1850 M Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20036

Jeffrey S. Linder Suzanne Yelen Kenneth J. Krisko Wiley, Rein & Fielding 1776 K Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20006

GTE

James D. Ellis Robert M. Lynch SBC Communications Inc. Room 1254 175 East Houston San Antonio, TX 78205

Lucille M. Mates SBC Communications Inc. Room 1526 140 New Montgomery Street San Francisco, CA 94105 Durward D. Dupre Mary W. Marks Jonathan W. Royston Southwestern Bell Telephone Company Room 3520 One Bell Center St. Louis, MO 63101

COX

Nancy Rue Frost & Jacobs, LLP 2500 PNC Center 201 East 5th Street Cincinnati, OH 45202 CBTC

Thomas E. Taylor Cincinnati Bell Telephone Company 6th Floor 201 East 4th Street Cincinnati, OH 45202

M. Robert Sutherland BellSouth Corporation BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Suite 1700 1155 Peachtree Street, N.E. Atlanta, GA 30309 Kathy L. Shobert General Communications, Inc. Suite 900 901 15th Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005

Robert N. Kittel Cecil O. Simpson, Jr. United States Army Litigation Center Suite 713 901 North Stuart Street Arlington, VA 22202-1837 Emily C. Hewitt George N. Barclay Michael J. Ettner General Services Administration Room 4002 1800 F Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20405

Don Sussman MCI Telecommunications Corporation 1801 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20006

Richard A. Askoff National Exchange Carrier Association 100 South Jefferson Road Whippany, NJ 07981

Tina M. Pidgeon

Drinker, Biddle & Reath, LLP
Suite 900
901 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005

Mary McDermott Linda Kent Keith Townsend Hance Haney United States Telephone Association Suite 600 1401 H Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005

(CC97212/JH/ss) (Last Update: 1/26/98)

Betty D. Montgomery
Duane W. Luckey
Steven T. Nourse
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
7th Floor
180 East Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43215-8764